

SOUTHREPPS PF/19/0771 – Residential development of 15 dwellings with associated access, onsite parking provision, gardens, open space and off-site highways improvements to Long Lane Estate and Long Lane including the provision of a footpath from the proposed development site to the High Street: Land at Long Lane, Southrepps, for Victory Housing

Major Development

- Target Date: 13 August 2019

- Extension of Time: 31 January 2020

Case Officer: Mr James Mann

Full Planning Permission

RELEVANT CONSTRAINTS

Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Proposed Residential Use Allocation

Outside of defined Settlement Boundary within the LDF

Designated Countryside within the LDF

Controlled Water Risk – Medium (Ground Water Pollution)

Unclassified Road

Mineral Safeguard Area

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

PF/17/1173 PF

Land off Long Lane, Southrepps, NR11 8NL

Erection of 24 No. dwellings with associated access, onsite parking provision, gardens and open space

Withdrawn 24/11/2017

PF/17/2082 PF

Land off Long Lane, Southrepps, Norfolk

Erection of 20 no. dwellings with associated access, onsite parking provision, gardens and open space, & the demolition of existing garages to create additional residents/visitor parking

Refused 18/05/2018

Planning Committee refused application PF/17/2082 on 17 May 2018 on the following grounds:

- The amount of development proposed and the potential impact this would have on the character of the surrounding landscape and the significantly detrimental impact on the special qualities of the AONB;
- The quantum of development proposed and the expected nature and volume of the traffic generated and the detrimental impact upon highway safety; and,
- The unclassified roads and pedestrian links serving the site were considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed.

THE SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located on agricultural land on the south-west corner of the village being adjacent to existing single and two storey dwellings but highly visible when approaching Southrepps from either Thorpe Road (from the west) or Long Lane (from the south).

Southrepps is designated as a 'Service Village' having a range of facilities including shops, pub, village hall, social club, post office and a recreation area which includes a children's play area, playing field and allotments.

The site is included within the Council's Site Allocations Development Plan Document adopted Feb 2011 and is referred to as SOU 02 – Land West of Long Lane. The allocation expected approximately 10 dwellings of which 5 (50%) should be affordable housing. Whilst the site allocation states that the site is 0.6 hectares it is actually approximately 0.9 hectares in size. The planning application site area includes all 0.9ha of the policy allocation area.

The site is located within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The south-western corner of Southrepps Conservation Area is approximately 100 metres to the east of the nearest proposed dwellings.

The following heritage assets (Listed Buildings) are within 500 metres of the application site:

- Church of St James (Grade I), 500 metres to the NW
- Beechlands Farmhouse and barn (Grade II and II*), 400 metres to the NW
- Church Farmhouse and barns (Grade II), 400 metres to the NW
- The Grange (Grade II), 250 metres to the NW
- Ham House (Grade II), 260 metres to the NW
- Vernon Arms (Grade II), 260 metres to the NW

The architectural style in the village is quite mixed, with the area surrounding the application site consisting of older and more modern 20th Century single and two storey dwellings of conventional brick construction including the more recent Drury's Yard development north of the site.

The site is accessed via two roads called Long Lane. For the purposes of this report, 'Long Lane' refers to that running north-south connecting the Antingham & Southrepps Primary school and High Street, and 'Long Lane Estate' is the east-west link road connecting Long Lane to the application site.

There is an existing Public Right of Way directly opposite the Long Lane Estate / Long Lane junction which leads to the village recreation area (290 metres) and on to the Village Hall / High Street (520 metres).

At the time of the officer site visit it was evident that there were potential issues with the width of Long Lane Estate and there were noticeable issues regarding parking of cars on the sides of the road. Furthermore, it was noted that Long Lane was narrow all the way to the High Street and this stretch of the road had no formal footpath.

Long Lane is designated as a Quiet Lane leading to Antingham and Southrepps Primary School (1.9km). Whilst Long Lane does not have a dedicated footpath, there is an established alternative in the form of the Paston Way, providing a slightly shorter off-road alternative to the School (1.8km).

The existing site is accessed from Long Lane via an adopted link Road (known as Long Lane Estate), containing a footpath to each side of the carriageway. A survey of this section of adopted highway found that the carriageway was approximately 4.3 metres wide and the footways to each side of the carriageway ranging from 1.67 to 1.84 metres wide.

THE APPLICATION

Seeks full permission for erection of 15 no. dwellings with associated access, onsite parking provision, gardens and open space and the demolition of two blocks of existing garages on Long Lane Estate to create additional residents/visitor parking. The applicant is also proposing to install a footpath along the west side of Long Lane and the widening of Long Lane at the Long Lane Estate junction to facilitate suitable visibility splays, as well as various off-site highways works along Long Lane Estate including the widening of the road to provide passing places.

The applicant, Victory Housing (Flagship Housing Group) are also the owners of both blocks of garages and the land immediately adjacent to the Long Lane carriageway.

All 15 dwellings are proposed to be affordable housing, comprising the following mix:

For Affordable Rent:

- 2 x 1 Bedroom 2 person Bungalows
- 2 x 1 Bedroom 2 person Houses
- 2 x 2 Bedroom 4 person Houses
- 2 x 3 Bedroom 6 person Bungalows
- 1 x 4 Bedroom 7 person House

For Shared Ownership:

- 1 x 2 Bedroom 4 person Bungalow
- 1 x 3 Bedroom 5 person Bungalow
- 2 x 2 Bedroom 4 person House
- 2 x 3 Bedroom 5 person House

REASONS FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

- The proposal is contrary to adopted Site Allocation Plan Policy SOU 02.
- Technical objection from the Highway Authority.
- Cllr Nigel Pearce had been unable to allow delegated authority whilst there remained outstanding objections from the Parish Council and the Highway Authority.

PARISH COUNCIL

Southrepps Parish Council – Objection to the plans as originally submitted

The key points of the objection are summarised as follows:

- *No provision/use of local vernacular and historical design or building materials being utilised; which would be more in keeping and suitable for a conservation village within the North Norfolk AONB.*
- *Development exceeds Policy SOU 02.*
- *Long Lane is narrow and has no public footpath with poor visibility (Policy CT 5)*
- *Greenfield site in the AONB*
- *Countryside location with no proven local need*
- *The proposal does not contribute to the delivery of sustainable development and does not ensue the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment (Policy SS 2)*

- *No good access to infrastructure, public services or utilities. Distant to the local school (Policy SS 6)*
- *Proposal not appropriate to the social economic and environmental well-being of the village and is not desirable for the understanding and enjoyment of the area. (Policy EN 1)*
- *The proposal is not sympathetic to the wider landscape (Policy EN 2)*
- *Tree (T3) is on private land and should not be considered as part of this application*
- *No proposed street lighting*
- *The design does not relate sympathetically to the surroundings. The properties to the north of the site are approximately 1.5 meters lower than the proposed development. Issues raised regarding overlooking. Tree canopies to be reduced in size, which is unacceptable (Policy EN 4).*
- *Preliminary Ecological Assessment shows photographs that do not relate to the site*
- *The Arboricultural Impact Assessment appears to relate to a previous plan of the site.*

REPRESENTATIONS

During the first public consultation period a total of 37 representations were made. 2 representations were submitted in support of the proposal 32 were submitted in opposition to the proposal and 3 general comments were received.

The key points raised in OBJECTION are as follows:

- Long Lane is poorly lit, combined with the lack of footways is unsafe. Any increase in traffic flows poses a danger to highway safety
- Increase in heavy vehicles and the suitability of the highway to cope with these
- More than 10 dwellings set out in Policy SOU 02
- Not built in accordance with the local vernacular / does not fit the local historical context
- Flood risk
- Lack of amenities within the village
- Trees being cut down/removed prior to the application being made
- Global warming – do not cut down trees and hedges
- Visual amenity and light pollution from 2 storey development
- Overdevelopment of the village
- Speed of traffic entering and leaving the village
- Impact upon wildlife
- Impact of development upon the Norfolk Coast AONB
- Overdevelopment on the site (Density)

The key points raised in SUPPORT are as follows:

- Request a public footpath should be put in from the site to the shop or bus stop.
- Need for further affordable housing in the village
- Infrastructure can cope with the increased population growth in terms of the school, the bus, the shop / post office and pub.
- Increase in population will reduce social isolation

CONSULTATIONS

The first round of consultation took place for a period of 21 days between 16/05/2019 and 06/06/2019. Following this consultation, amendments to the layout and additional highways network improvements have been proposed. These amendments were then consulted on from

11/12/2019 to 09/01/2020. Given that this committee report is due to be published around 19th December in advance of the 9th January meeting, all responses to this second period of public consultation will be provided to Members by written and verbal update.

Officers acknowledge the timing of this additional consultation period is unfortunate, not least because it leaves little time for consultees to consider the proposals formally, but some pre-submission negotiations have been underway to expedite quicker responses. However, the applicant has stressed that they have secure funding via a national grant programme, which would be at risk if a decision were not granted before February 2020: a 'commencement' to start the permission would be required by the end of March 2020 in order to secure that funding.

Due to the timing of the writing of this report, the following comments are those received during the first consultation period.

Norfolk Coast Partnership – Support the plans as originally submitted

The Norfolk Coast Partnership support the scheme to enable families with lower incomes to be able to live in their local area. The site is situated within the Tributary Farmland area of the Integrated Landscape Character Guidance for the Norfolk Coast AONB. This is an exceptionally open landscape with fewer than average woodlands and a low presence of hedgerows. Two key forces for change which are applicable to this application include:

- 1. Development pressures on the edges of settlements and as infill within them, often eroding the small pastures which are characteristic of the landscape and which help to integrate the villages within the wider countryside.*
- 2. Extensions to existing properties, subdivision of landholdings within settlements, external lighting and inappropriate boundary fencing which result from increasing affluence and which cumulatively contribute to the suburbanisation of the area.*

As a result, reinstatement of native hedging and trees to the boundary of the site through condition would be more sympathetic to the landscape than boundary fencing. External Lighting should also be considered, recognising the importance of preserving dark landscapes and dark skies.

Anglian Water – No Objection to the plans as originally submitted

Assets affected

- Anglian Water has assets close to or crossing this site or there are assets subject to an adoption agreement. The site layout should take this into account and accommodate those assets within either prospectively adoptable highways or public open space. If this is not practicable then sewers will need to be diverted at the developers cost under Section 185 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Or, in the case of apparatus under an adoption agreement, liaise with the owners of the apparatus. It should be noted that the diversion works should normally be completed before development can commence.*

Wastewater Treatment

- The foul drainage from this development is in the catchment of Southrepps Lower St Water Recycling Centre that will have available capacity for these flows.*

Used Water Network

- *The sewerage system at present has available capacity for these flows via a gravity connection to the public foul sewer. Anglian Water have provided advice and set out 5 informatives notes in regard to the used water network.*

Surface Water Disposal

- *Anglian Water's preferred method of surface water disposal would be to a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) with connection to the sewer seen as the last option.*
- *Should the proposed method of surface water management change to include interaction with Anglian Water operated assets, we would wish to be re-consulted to ensure that an affective water drainage strategy is prepared and implemented.*

Norfolk County Council – Highways Authority – Objection to the plans as originally submitted

Southrepps is a relatively small village with limited services. The Primary school is also remote from the proposed development site via narrow roads with no provision for pedestrians or cyclists, to the detriment of highway safety.

Furthermore, Long Lane (C292) from High Street is severely sub-standard in terms of width and footway provision. The existing unclassified section of Long Lane (U14453) is less than 4.8m wide and therefore also not wide enough for an HGV such as a refuse vehicle or other delivery vehicle to pass a car without mounting the adjacent footway. As a consequence, it would not be appropriate to serve a further 15 dwellings via this substandard network.

Therefore, the County Council would not support estate scale development at this location, in the interests of highway safety.

Notwithstanding the above, I note this site is allocated for approximately 10 dwellings and therefore would not seek to resist development that is in accordance with the allocation. However, the application is for 15 dwellings, which will generate significantly more traffic and pedestrians on the surrounding severely sub-standard highway network.

As a consequence, in relation to highway related matters, the County Council would recommend this planning application be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development does not adequately provide off-site facilities for pedestrians to link with existing provision and local services.

The roads serving the site are considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of their restricted width and lack of passing provision. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety.

Norfolk County Council – Public Rights of Way – No objection to the plans as originally submitted

No objection as although there is a public right of way, Southrepps Public Footpath 18, recorded on the definitive map in the vicinity of the application site, it does not appear to be affected by the proposals.

Norfolk County Council – Lead Local Flood Authority – No Objection to the plans as originally submitted

The Lead Local Flood Authority raise no objection to the scheme subject to a pre-commencement condition setting out that detailed designs should be submitted to and agreed with the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority.

NNDC – Environmental Health Officer – No Objection to the plans as originally submitted

No objection or comments.

NNDC – Strategic Housing – Support the plans as originally submitted

- *There is a proven housing need for the provision of more affordable housing in Southrepps, with 66 applicants on the Housing Register, 71 applicants on the Transfer Register and 617 on the Housing Options Register who have a housing need and require housing in Southrepps. It should be noted that there are currently no shared ownership properties in Southrepps and therefore this scheme will provide the first shared ownership properties in the village. The 6 bungalows proposed will provide much needed accommodation suitable for the needs of those who acquire an accessible property.*
- *The scheme is compliant with Policy HO 1 as over 50% of the proposed dwelling have two or less bedrooms and 30% of the dwellings are suitable for or easily adaptable for the elderly, infirm or disabled.*
- *Although the scheme will be 100% affordable, the provision of at least 50% of the proposed dwellings must be secured through a Section 106 Agreement in accordance with the requirements of Policy HO 2.*

NNDC - Conservation and Design Officer – No Objection to the plans as originally submitted

The site lies within the AONB and its edge of village location holds a close interrelationship with the surrounding rural landscape. The close connection to development off Long Lane and Drury's Yard represents a natural extension to the built envelope of the village.

Reducing the number of units by five dwellings from the 20 proposed in 2017 has helped to alleviate the sense of intensification within this sensitive rural location. The development now portrays a fairly loose knit form and more verdant character. That said, the fundamental layout and groupings remain largely unaltered. The plots do sit more comfortably on site and benefit from some breathing space between groupings. When considering the development in relation to the immediate context, the pattern of development and overall sense of scale does not seem disproportionate or overly intensive and conforms with the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

The layout remains focussed on the entranceway hammerhead which services the three groupings to the north, west and south. The entranceway dwellings address this primary access but the development becomes more informal and irregular as you move through the site. This distinct move away from the formalised straight lines and regimented blocks of the neighbouring development will offer a richer sense of place and more visual interest. Whilst the layout places greater emphasis on green edges and meaningful open space, it still suffers from the domination of privatised enclosures and the demarcation of space. These heavy and somewhat imposing enclosures are particularly unappealing on the boundaries between public open spaces. Those boundaries' which face onto these spaces should be complemented with additional planting to soften the enclosure and mitigate their impact. Further details of the brick and fence enclosures will be required prior to commencement. The general change in emphasis away from hard landscaping to soft landscaping would assist in creating a more pleasant environment which reflects the green setting and rural context.

The absence of any garaging and the informal nature of the access roads could give way to a parking dominated scheme. It is vital that the proposed pull off spaces and driveways are utilised rather than residents parking on the green edges and open spaces.

The house types on offer all follow a rather bland neo-traditional form of architecture. The rather uninspired approach is characterised by traditional pitched roofs and a palette of materials predominantly based on brick and pantile. Given the architectural currency of the immediate context to the east and north of the site, this design approach and the finishing treatments raise no overriding cause for concern. That being said, an injection of interest at eaves level, through opening portions or at roofscape level would not go amiss.

In terms of heritage assets, the impact of the development is low and on the spectrum of harm most certainly less than substantial. The site lies 100m west of the designated Southrepps Conservation Area. This separation distance is further diluted by intervening modern development. The relationship between the site and the rural landscape context is significant but views between the site and the conservation area are limited and do not contribute to the Conservation Area's special character or appearance. Whilst development here will erode the rural setting of the conservation area, the impact on the essential qualities of the Conservation Area is relatively minor and can only be felt by longer range views. The development is over 300m away from the nearest listed buildings which centre on the High Street and Chapel Street within the historic core of the village. Again, the separation distance and physical detachment makes the impact on setting low.

In terms of materials, the use of red multi stock bricks and anthracite pantiles raise no overriding concerns in principle. The use of white render has potential to appear rather stark and perhaps an off-white or cream would offer a more subtle finish.

In the event of the application being approved the following conditions should be attached:

- *brick and tile samples to be agreed*
- *windows and doors to be agreed*
- *Details of the brick and fence enclosures shall be agreed*

Overall, Conservation and Design Officers consider that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset (namely the Southrepps Conservation Area). Whilst no significant design improvements have come forward since the last application, the reduction in scale and density has resulted in reducing the intensification of the site and its impact on the wider setting.

NNDC Landscape Officer – No objection to the plans as originally submitted - subject to revisions being made

Impact on the surrounding area

The submitted Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment by James Blake Associates (Feb 2018, revised May 2019) concludes that post development and with the proposed landscape mitigation the 'majority of residual effects will be Minor Adverse or Negligible' (LVIA 8.3.4). In relation to effect on land use and the character of the Norfolk Coast AONB, the Assessment finds a long term Moderate Adverse effect. These adverse effects are not insignificant and the NNDC Landscape Team considers that these could be further reduced through a revised layout reducing the height of the built form in the prominent south west corner of the site.

The 3D sketches and the Long Lane and Thorpe Road Visuals demonstrate how the south-west section of the site is visually the most prominent. All of the built form in this part of the site is proposed as two-storey, with the single-storey bungalows sited within the less obtrusive parts of the site. A revised layout setting the single-storey units in the south west part of the site would make a significant difference in the successful assimilation of the scheme into its sensitive designated open landscape setting and reducing the landscape and visual impact of the proposal.

Hard Landscaping

It is acknowledged within the submission that appropriate treatment of the site boundaries is a critical design element affecting how well the development will be accommodated within its open landscape setting.

The submitted landscape plan by C J Yardley is unclear as to the precise nature of all boundaries, both within and on the edge of the site. It is not clear which is wall and which is close board fence and exactly where this is to be located. In addition, the submitted visualisations do not tally with the landscape plan in relation to the proposed plot boundaries (fencing and walling). Given that this is such an important design element; more clarity is required. Aside from this there appears to be an excessive use of close board fencing. This should be rationalised, should include for small mammal access (13cm x 13cm gaps at 6m intervals along all runs of close board fencing) to allow ecological connectivity throughout the site and is not appropriate along any of the site boundaries. As previously advised there should be more use of hedging to delineate curtilage. Privet hedging, for example, would be suitable and would align with the established privet hedging on the adjacent existing housing units.

The long section of 1.8m high brick wall close to Plots 2,3 & 4 will be very prominent and the small amount of ivy proposed to screen this will not be effective. Bordering the main area of open space this should be a softer boundary including much more substantial planting. A 1.8m dense brick wall is not appropriate here and will be prominent in the landscape until the site boundary planting matures.

Soft Landscaping

The soft landscape proposals are broadly appropriate, particularly along the site boundaries. Tree species are suitable for the site setting, although the 2no. Carpinus betulus proposed close to Plot 1 and in a prominent location near the site boundary should not be the 'fastigiata' variety. There is space here for the standard version of this species.

The NNDC Landscape Team are concerned that the soft landscape proposals do not align with the Drainage Strategy by Rossi Long. Trees are sited directly above a highway soakaway close to the turning head. These two elements of the scheme should be reviewed to ensure that they are complementary.

Ecology

The submitted Preliminary Ecological Survey by CJ Yardley (Feb 2018) assesses the ecological value of the site as Low and with the proposed landscape planting and tailored mitigation such as small mammal access and provision of nest boxes, the overall assessment of impact resulting from the development would be Neutral. The Landscape section concur with these findings and would recommend that all mitigation measures and recommendations contained within Section 5 of the Ecological Survey and specifications for bat and bird boxes set out within the Landscape Schedule and Landscape Management Plan by CY Yardley (April 2019) are secured by condition.

Subject to satisfactory amendments to the submission as outlined above, the Landscape section would have no further issues relating to this proposal, subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

POLICIES

North Norfolk Site Allocations Plan (Adopted February 2011):

Policy SOU 02: Land West of Long Lane

North Norfolk Core Strategy (Adopted September 2008):

Policy SS 1: Spatial Strategy for North Norfolk

Policy SS 3: Housing

Policy SS 4: Environment

Policy SS 6: Access and Infrastructure

Policy HO 1: Dwelling mix and type

Policy HO 2: Provision of Affordable Housing

Policy HO 7: Making the most efficient use of land

Policy EN 1: Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and The Broads

Policy EN 2: Protection and enhancement of landscape and settlement character

Policy EN 4: Design

Policy EN 6: Sustainable construction and energy efficiency

Policy EN 8: Protecting and enhancing the historic environment

Policy EN 9: Biodiversity and geology

Policy EN 10: Flood risk

Policy EN 13: Pollution and hazard prevention and minimisation

Policy CT 2: Development contributions

Policy CT 5: The transport impact on new development

Policy CT 6: Parking provision

Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (2018)

North Norfolk Design Guide (2008)

Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2010-2026 (adopted September 2011)

Policy CS 16: Safeguarding mineral and waste sites and mineral resources

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):

Section 5: Delivering a sufficient supply of Homes

Section 6: Building a Strong and Competitive Economy

Section 8: Promoting Safe and Healthy Communities

Section 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport

Section 12: Achieving well-designed places

Section 14: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, Flooding and Coastal Change

Section 15: Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Section 16: Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

Other material considerations:

Human Rights Implications

It is considered that the proposed development may raise issues relevant to

- Article 8: The Right to respect for private and family life.
- Article 1 of the First Protocol: The right to peaceful enjoyment of possessions.

Having considered the likely impact on an individual's Human Rights, and the general interest of the public, approval of this application as recommended is considered to be justified, proportionate and in accordance with planning law.

Crime and Disorder Act 1998 - Section 17

The application raises no significant crime and disorder issues.

MAIN ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Principle of Development
2. Affordable Housing
3. Housing Mix and Type
4. Density, Layout, Design and Heritage
5. Trees and Landscape
6. Highways and Parking
7. Foul / Surface Water Drainage and Utilities
8. Other Material Planning Considerations
9. Planning Obligations

This application for 15 affordable dwellings has been revised following a first round of public consultation. Members should note that these changes comprise:

- Provision of a footpath from the site to the High Street along the western edge of Long Lane with a crossing point near the junction of the High Street;
- Widening of Long Lane with the junction of Long Lane Estate;
- Modifications to Long Lane Estate;
- Improvements to the Public Right of Way network; and
- Changes to the layout and increased landscaping to reduce the potential impact upon the AONB and wider landscape.

1. Principle of Development

The site is situated within the Service Village of Southrepps on land allocated through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (2011) for approximately 10 dwellings under Policy SOU 02, which also sets out a number of requirements for the site including:

- On site provision of the required proportion of affordable housing (50%);
- Contributions towards infrastructure, services and other community needs as required;
- Provision of a safe vehicle access to Long Lane;
- Provision of appropriate landscaping including boundary treatment to the agricultural land to the rear;
- Submission of a satisfactory scheme of improvements to local surface water drainage to address localised flooding concerns (properties to the north of the site);
- Measures to prevent the input of hazardous substances to ground water;
- Archaeological investigation if required; and
- Be sympathetic to the landscape character including the AONB

When the site was allocated it was expected that the proposal would include both market and affordable dwellings to meet a range of housing requirements in the village. However, to date, no formal application for market/affordable housing has come forward and this raises questions as to whether a scheme of 10 dwellings would or could be viable to develop. This has, in effect, provided an opportunity for a Registered Provider of affordable housing to propose a 100% affordable housing scheme for the site.

The principle of housing on this site is accepted through Policy SOU 02, however the scale of the development proposed is not in accordance with the policy requirements and therefore represents a departure from the Development Plan.

2. Affordable Housing

The proposal is for a 100% affordable housing scheme submitted by a Registered Provider and the 15 affordable dwellings to be provided far exceeds the 50% affordable dwelling requirement set through Policy SOU 02, which would only equate to 5 affordable dwellings if Policy SOU 02 were realised. The applicant (Victory Housing Trust) has advised that they will include all 15 dwellings in a Section 106 Agreement which will ensure all fifteen dwellings remain as affordable housing in perpetuity, accessible to all eligible persons on the General Needs Housing Register (i.e. not for use as “Local Needs” Rural Exception Scheme-type housing).

North Norfolk Strategic Housing have highlighted that there are a total of 66 applicants on the Housing Register, 71 applicants on the Transfer Register and 617 on the Housing Options Register who have a housing need and require housing in Southrepps. It has also been highlighted that Southrepps currently has no shared ownership housing in the village and this

scheme proposes 6 of the dwellings to be shared ownership (3 x 2 Bedroom Houses and 3 x 3 Bedroom Houses).

Although the proposal exceeds both the overall number of homes and the proportion expected as affordable housing as set out in SOU 02, there is clearly a need for affordable homes in this area as demonstrated by the number of applicants on the Housing Register, the Transfer Register and the Housing Options Register.

The proposal would not create a mixed community, as envisaged by the NPPF, but it is recognised that Southrepps has a shortage of affordable housing and this is a relatively small scale development which would not create too much of an imbalance in housing tenures by not including any market housing.

Subject to securing the affordable housing by way of S106 Obligation, the proposal would far exceed the requirements of Core Strategy Policy HO 2 and the affordable housing requirements of Site Allocation Policy SOU 02.

3. Housing Mix and Type

Policy HO 1 'Dwelling Mix and Type' sets out that on schemes of more than five dwellings at least 40% of the total number of dwelling shall comprise dwellings that do not exceed more than 70 sqm. and which shall incorporate two bedrooms or fewer. Furthermore, 20% of the dwellings shall be suitable or easily adaptable for occupation by the elderly, infirm or disabled. On a scheme of 15 dwellings this would equate to 6 dwellings being of two bedroom or fewer and 3 dwellings being either suitable or easily adaptable for occupation by the elderly, infirm or disabled.

The proposed scheme includes 4no. 1-bed dwellings and 3no. 2-bed dwellings that are small enough to be considered to constitute a small dwelling under Policy HO 1. In addition to this there are 2no. 2-bed dwellings (which are too big to fit within the HO 1 size criteria) also provided. The proposal is therefore in excess of the minimum 40% target as set out in Policy HO 1.

The proposal also includes 4 bungalows on site, two of which would be built to Category 2 of Part M of the Building Regulations, 'Accessible and adaptable dwellings'¹ standard. Although only two dwellings are proposed as Category 2 dwellings, there are two further bungalows which would meet the definition of being suitable for occupation by the elderly infirm or disabled. The dwellings proposed would equate to approximately 26% and would, therefore, be in accordance with Policy HO 1 of the Core Strategy, subject to imposing conditions to require their provision as such.

4. Density, Layout, Design and Heritage

Density

The site allocation Policy SOU 02 stated that the site had the capacity to accommodate approximately 10 dwellings on a stated site area of 0.6 hectares giving an approximate density

¹ Part M of the Building Regulations states M4(2) (Category 2 – Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings) 'will be met where a new dwelling makes reasonable provision for most people to access the dwelling and incorporates features that make it potentially suitable for a wide range of occupants, including older people, those with reduced mobility and some wheelchair users'.

of 17 dwellings per hectare. In fact, the site is actually understood to be 0.9 hectares and therefore 10 dwellings on a site of this size would give a density of just over 11 per hectare.

Policy HO 7 requires that in Service Villages, of which Southrepps is one, that density is not less than 30 dwelling per hectare. Subsequently, however, the NPPF, in Paragraph 122, sets out that decisions should support the efficient use of land taking into account the prevailing character and setting of the proposed development.

A scheme of 10 would therefore have a considerably lower density than the intent of Policy HO 7 but it is recognised this lower density took account for the site's edge of village location and location within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in accordance with Paragraph 122 of the NPPF.

On the basis of the site being 0.9 hectares, the proposal scheme of fifteen dwellings has a density of 17 dwellings per hectare which is less than the densities evident in the immediate existing built environment and, more importantly, in line with the density aspirations set out in Policy SOU 02. Such a level of density is considered to be acceptable subject to the development demonstrating compliance with other relevant Core Strategy Policies.

Layout

The Planning Officer's comments on the previous scheme for 20 dwellings (PF/17/2082), which was refused stated that:

"Although the proposal exceeds the estimated numbers in the Site Allocation, the development is not considered to be a cramped form of development as it incorporates two areas of open space. The non-linear layout and spacing between the dwellings coupled with the informal areas of open space to the frontage of many of the plots / western boundary, helps create a welcoming sense of approach to the site with scope for meaningful levels of soft landscaping."

The key elements of providing two areas of open space and a spacious distribution are retained in this revised proposal. The proposed development has reduced the housing numbers on the site to 15 and this has helped to alleviate the sense of intensification within this sensitive and rural location. The development now portrays a loose knit form and a more verdant character. The non-linear layout and spacing is retained and enhanced, creating a welcoming sense of approach to the site.

The distinction between public and private spaces, particularly around the areas of open space is clearly defined. The rear gardens are in conformity with the requirements of the North Norfolk Design Guide; being larger than the footprints of the properties. Through the proposed changes to the layout, the boundary treatments between private and public spaces have been enhanced in accordance with the requirements of the North Norfolk Design Guide.

Overbearing Design & Loss of Privacy

It is noted that the adjoining plots to the north are approximately 0.75 to 1 metre lower than existing ground levels on the site. Therefore, consideration needs to be given to whether or not the two storey dwellings (plots 14 & 15) could appear overbearing or result in loss of privacy in the rear gardens of the adjoining properties to the north.

The applicant has provided an additional 'Site Sections' drawing (9750-3000 P3 dated 23.01.19 and received on 31/07/2019). This demonstrates the relationship between plots 6, 7, 8 and 9, the existing properties to the east and the relationship between plots 12-15 on neighbouring, existing properties to the north of the site.

Plots 6, 7, 8 and 9 are two storey dwellings which back onto two storey dwellings. The window to window distance between these is approximately 25m and the topography of the site as shown on the Site Sections plan is not considered to be a factor in this regard.

Plots 12 and 13 are single story dwellings that have a window to window distance of approximately 35m (at the closest point of plot 13 to Field Bottom). The topography of the site as shown on Site Section B and Site Section C of the Site Sections drawing is relatively even. Furthermore, as the proposed dwellings on Plots 12 and 13 are single storey this would alleviate any concerns regarding overbearing.

Plots 14 and 15 are proposed as two storey dwellings and, as shown on Site Section D of the Site Sections drawing, the topography of the site is such that dwellings 14 and 15 are on a very similar level to the existing neighbouring properties (Field View and Dryad). The window to window distance between these dwellings being approximately 53 m is considered sufficient to conclude that any issues arising from this variation in height would be mitigated against by the intervening distance.

Plot 11, although not considered through the Site Section Plan, is within the closest proximity to number 29 Long Lane to the east of the site. Although this is only approximately 15m away there are no existing windows on the elevation of no. 29 and the proposed plans for Plot 11 only include a living room window on the proposed elevation facing no.29. Given that both of these dwellings are single storey it is considered that there would be no significant impact in regard to overbearing or loss of privacy.

Taking account of the existing / proposed soft landscaping along the northern boundary and the proximity / distance of the dwellings to the gardens in the adjacent properties, no significant loss of outlook or loss of privacy would result.

The layout satisfies the upper floor window to window distances as set out in the North Norfolk Design Guide. Although, further detail on appropriate hard and soft landscaping/boundary treatments will also ensure adequate levels of privacy within the development site itself. Subject to this the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policy EN 4 of the Core Strategy and the supporting guidance set out within the North Norfolk Design Guide.

Design / Heritage

It should be noted that the strict 'no harm permissible' requirement in Policy EN 8 is not in strict conformity with the guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). As a result, in considering any proposal for the site the Local Planning Authority will need to take into consideration Section 16, paragraph 196 of the NPPF. This requires that where a development proposal will lead to 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of a designated heritage asset, including its setting, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

Whilst development here will erode the rural setting of the Conservation Area, the impact on the essential qualities of the Conservation Area is relatively minor and can only be felt by longer range views. The site itself lies 100m west of the Southrepps Conservation Area and approximately 300m away from the nearest listed buildings which centre on the High Street and Chapel Street within the historic core of the village. The separation distances and the physical detachment results in a minimal impact on the setting of the listed buildings.

The house types proposed follow a neo-traditional form of architecture. The palette of materials predominantly based on brick and pantile. To help minimise any visual impacts it is

recommended that conditions are imposed in respect of samples of the brick, tile, exterior finishing materials, window and doors.

Concerns were raised through the first public consultation in regard to the potential impact upon the wider landscape and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that the proposal represents an excessive form of development in the context of the existing scale of the village. Further amendments have been proposed by the applicant to seek to mitigate the impact upon the AONB by reducing the height of buildings on the edge of the site and thus creating a less harmful impact upon the AONB and wider landscape. Furthermore, additional landscaping has been sought which would further mitigate the impact of the proposal.

It is acknowledged that there would be a minor degree of less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area, but that this is very minor and the public benefits required to outweigh this harm would need to be equally minor. A conclusion is made regarding this in the Planning Balance section in Chapter 10 of this report.

On consideration of the proximity of the proposal in regards to the existing built environment and subject to the application of conditions, the development is considered to be in general accordance with Core Strategy Policies EN 4 and EN 8 and paragraphs 192 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. Trees and Landscape

Norfolk Coast AONB and Landscape

The proposed site is situated within the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Policy EN 1 of the Core Strategy sets out that development will be permitted where: It is appropriate to the economic social and environmental well-being of the area or is desirable for the understanding and enjoyment of the area; does not detract from the special qualities of the AONB; and seeks to facilitate delivery of the Norfolk Coast AONB management plan objectives. The full text of Policy EN 1 is set out as follows:

“The impact of individual proposals, and their cumulative effect, on the Norfolk Coast AONB, The Broads and their settings, will be carefully assessed. Development will be permitted where it;

- *is appropriate to the economic, social and environmental well-being of the area or is desirable for the understanding and enjoyment of the area;*
- *does not detract from the special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB or The Broads; and*
- *seeks to facilitate delivery of the Norfolk Coast AONB management plan objectives.*

Opportunities for remediation and improvement of damaged landscapes will be taken as they arise.

Proposals that have an adverse effect will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that they cannot be located on alternative sites that would cause less harm and the benefits of the development clearly outweigh any adverse impacts.

Development proposals that would be significantly detrimental to the special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB or The Broads and their settings will not be permitted.”

The site was allocated in policy SOU 02 in 2011, but since then the National Planning Policy Framework was published in 2012 and subsequently in 2018 and 2019 revisions also requires that no major development shall take place in the AONB other than in exceptional circumstances. Therefore, there is a conflict between the allocation and the more up-to-date national guidance. However, the NPPF is a material consideration in decision making and this expects Local Planning Authorities to make decisions in accordance with the Development Plan. The site is an allocated site within the Development Plan and would therefore outweigh the conflict with the NPPF in this regard.

A key consideration is the impact of the development on the special qualities of the Norfolk Coast AONB. The applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which has informed the layout and design of the scheme. Further to this, to reflect the key views defined in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), the applicant has provided Key View Visuals from both Long Lane and Thorpe Road.

Within the original proposals, which were subject to the first round of public consultation, there were six new dwellings proposed to be located in the area on the north west of the site. These were all 2 storey dwellings. Landscape Officers raised concerns regarding the two storey dwellings in this location given the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), which highlighted that this would be within prominent key views from both Long Lane and Thorpe Road.

Subsequently, the applicant has revised the layout of the scheme. The number of dwellings in the northwest cluster on the site has been reduced to 5 dwellings. Four of these dwellings are now single storey bungalows, with only plot 3 being 2 storeys. This is considered to alleviate the concerns in regard to the wider landscape impact and the impact upon the AONB.

Whilst the NPPF sets out that no major development should take place in the AONB other than in exceptional circumstance. The site is allocated for residential development within an adopted Development Plan Document. The further changes to the proposed layout seek to alleviate the concerns regarding the potential impacts upon the special qualities of the AONB. This has been secured not just through reduced density and scale of development but also by amending the design of roof form to avoid visual impact of gable and more tree planting to provide sufficient screening. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy EN 1 of the adopted Core Strategy.

Whilst there is also a requirement to secure renewable energy on site through Policy EN 6, any proposal for solar panels for example, needs to address the impact on the AONB, particularly in regard to solar panels on south facing dwellings, as this would then have an impact upon views into the AONB.

Policy EN 2 sets out that proposal should be informed by and be sympathetic to the distinctive character areas identified in the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment. The site is situated within the Tributary Farmland (TF1) landscape character area as defined by the North Norfolk Landscape Character Assessment (2018). The landscape guidelines defined in the landscape character area that are relevant to the site seek to achieve the following:

- Conserve the sense of rurality:
 - Maintaining rural features that contribute to the character, biodiversity and historical continuity, including rural lanes.
 - New planting associated with development should blend with existing features rather than simply trying to screen new development
- Conserve the nucleated character of villages:
 - Avoid linear sprawl

- Ensure any new development is well integrated into the landscape and does not form a harsh edge.

The proposal is considered to be broadly in accordance with the landscape guidelines. Indeed, in comparison with conventional close boarded fence (which are evident on part of the settlement boundary), the provision of a post and rail fence coupled with the higher levels of soft landscaping along the western and southern boundaries will provide a more sensitive transition with the surrounding landscaping. These are expected in subsequent revisions and can be secured by condition.

Subject to robust pre-commencement conditions in regard soft landscaping and boundary treatment, the proposal is considered to be in accordance with Policies EN 1 and EN 2 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

Hard landscaping

At present the hard landscaping proposed through the site is not considered acceptable due to the following reasons:

- Walls dividing public open space and private gardens would not provide a sufficient quality of design of the public realm and appear incongruous to the open rural edge of the settlement, drawing attention to the site presence.
- Close Board Fencing and Walls would not allow wildlife to access the site and pass through the site.

Notwithstanding that a Registered Provider may expect to meet Secure by Design criteria, it is considered that the boundary treatments should be much softer and could include some smaller extent of timber fencing with soft landscaping or closed boarded fencing with sufficient gaps for wildlife corridors (13cm x 13cm at 6m intervals) and soft landscaping pm the exterior facing elevations.

It is considered that the revision of these hard landscaping plans should be provided prior to any permission being granted which can be arranged under delegated authority. A further condition would then be included to ensure that there is suitable maintenance of the hard landscaping, boundary treatments and screening.

Soft Landscaping

There are a number of mature trees and hedges along the northern boundary of the site which have amenity/biodiversity value. The submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) and Method Statement (AMS) dated February 2018, demonstrates that the protection of this soft landscaping is feasible. Although, it is recommended that any permission have a condition requiring that the development be in accordance with the AIA and AMS.

The original proposals in regard to soft landscaping were considered to be broadly appropriate, particularly along the site boundaries, with tree species being considered suitable for the site setting. Further landscaping was requested along the southern boundary to ensure that adequate screening was provided when entering the village from Long Lane. Additional comments were raised that the Drainage Plans and Landscape Plans did not reflect each other, in that the drainage chambers had planting above them.

Following the consultation, plans have been revised in order to address some of the original concerns. Additional landscaping is proposed on the western and southern boundaries of the site.

However, the conflict between the drainage plans and landscape plans has not been addressed at the time of writing this report and this would be required prior to the potential grant of permission of this application which could also be resolved under delegated authority. A condition would also be sought in regard to a detailed soft landscape scheme that would address management and maintenance of the proposed scheme.

Ecology

The submitted Preliminary Ecological Survey by CJ Yardley (Feb 2018) assesses the ecological value of the site as Low and with the proposed landscape planting and tailored mitigation such as small mammal access and provision of nest boxes, the overall assessment of impact resulting from the development would be Neutral.

It is recommended that all mitigation measures and recommendations contained within Section 5 of the Ecological Survey and specifications for bat and bird boxes set out within the Landscape Schedule and Landscape Management Plan are secured by condition. Subject to this, the proposal would accord with Core Strategy Policy EN 9.

Habitats Regulation Assessment

Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) the 'competent authority', North Norfolk District Council, must undertake a formal assessment of the implications of any new plan or project or designated European sites (known as Natura 2000 sites).

The Recreation Impacts: Visitor Surveys at European Protected sites across Norfolk study (2016) by Footprint Ecology, highlighted that there will be a 14% increase of visitors to the Broads and a 9% increase of visitors to the North Norfolk coast during the current plan period as a result of the planned residential growth across the County. Historically, a fee of £50 has been sought for each residential dwelling within the District has been secured through planning obligations. This fee goes towards monitoring and mitigating visitor impact on the North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Special Protection Area (SPA) and other Natura 2000 sites.

As the site was allocated through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document it was subject to a plan wide Habitats Regulation Assessment at the time of allocation. It is considered that the net additional 5no. dwellings more than the allocated 10 is a sufficiently minor increase that a full Habitats Regulations Assessment is not necessary and it can be considered that the additional 5 dwellings will not likely cause a significant effect on the special qualities of designated European Sites if minor mitigation can be provided. The applicant has agreed to make a contribution of £50 per dwelling towards the monitoring and mitigation of the visitor pressure upon the European Sites.

Further to this, the applicant has agreed to provide/fund further improvements to the Public Rights of Way network, which will encourage people to utilise local footways and help reduce the impact upon the European Sites within the District.

It is considered that these are sufficient to ensure there is no likely significant effect upon European Sites arising from this development.

Open space

The Core Strategy's Open Space Standards require a development of 15 dwellings to provide the following levels of open space:

- Parks = 395 sqm
 - Play = 96 sqm
 - Greenspace = 304 sqm
 - Allotments = 195 sqm
- Total = 990 sqm

The development provides two areas of natural green space. This open space will be owned and maintained by Victory Housing Trust. Whilst this quantum of open space is in excess of the requirement for natural greenspace on the scheme, providing a public benefit in this regard, it does not address the sport or recreation demand that would arise from a development of this scale.

As a result of this deficiency the following off-site contributions are required by planning obligation:

- Allotments: £6,810
- Play: £4,800 (To be spent on Play Equipment in the Parish to be agreed with the District Council)
- Parks: £13,832 (To be spent on Play Equipment in the Parish to be agreed with the District Council)

The applicant set out in their Planning Statement that they would be willing to pay contributions towards offsite play space requested by the Parish Council. During the first consultation the Parish Council set out a request for £30,000. However, North Norfolk District Council's Open Space calculator sets out that a fee of £4,800 would be required towards the provision of play space and £13,832 would be required towards Park Space to address the impacts of development. Any surplus financial contribution would have to be considered a public benefit.

Subject to the management of the proposed open space being secured by condition and policy-related contributions to be provided in regard to allotments, play and park provision via a Section 106 agreement, the proposal is considered to be in general accordance with the requirements of Core Strategy CT 2.

6. Highways and Parking Impacts

Transport / highway impact

Site Allocation Policy SOU 02 'Land West of Long Lane' only expressly requires provision of 'safe vehicle access to Long Lane' (Via Long Lane Estate) for a scheme of approximately 10 dwellings. The policy goes further stating that contributions towards infrastructure, services and other community needs as required will be sought. This is considered to include more community safety and pedestrian infrastructure for schemes of schemes of 10 or more dwellings.

Policy CT 5 'The Transport Impact of New Development' sets out the following:

Development will be designed to reduce the need to travel and to maximise the use of sustainable forms of transport appropriate to its particular location. Development proposals will be considered against the following criteria:

- *the proposal provides for safe and convenient access on foot, cycle, public and private transport addressing the needs of all, including those with a disability;*

- *the proposal is capable of being served by safe access to the highway network without detriment to the amenity or character of the locality;*
- *the expected nature and volume of traffic generated by the proposal could be accommodated by the existing road network without detriment to the amenity or character of the surrounding area or highway safety; and*
- *if the proposal would have significant transport implications, it is accompanied by a transport assessment, the coverage and detail of which reflects the scale of development and the extent of the transport implications, and also, for non-residential schemes, a travel plan.*

However, paragraph 109 of the NPPF also states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts of the development are 'severe'.

The principle of taking vehicle access from Long Lane via the existing junction to Long Lane Estate has already been deemed acceptable (in terms of sustainability of location and access) through the allocation process of site SOU 02 through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document, albeit only for 10 dwellings. Whilst the number of dwellings proposed is now in excess of that deemed acceptable through Policy SOU 02, the established visibility splays at that junction within a 30mph speed limit are considered acceptable.

A previous application on the site for 20 dwellings (PF/17/2082) was refused by Development Committee, primarily on highway grounds. There were two principle area of concern regarding highway access: (i) the lack of pedestrian safety without a footpath along Long Lane up to High Street and (ii) the restricted nature of Long Lane Estate which limits the improvements that might be possible to provide safe access from Long lane to the site.

The absence of measures to provide safe pedestrian and vehicle access would be contrary to both Policies SOU 02 and CT5.

Long Lane

During the first stage of consultation of this application no improvements were proposed to Long lane, however during the consultation the Highway Authority raised the following primary reasons for recommending that the application is refused:

- *The proposed development does not adequately provide off-site facilities for pedestrians to link with existing provision and local services; and*
- *The roads serving the site are considered to be inadequate to serve the development proposed, by reason of their restricted width and lack of passing provision. The proposal, if permitted, would be likely to give rise to conditions detrimental to highway safety.*

Following this the applicant set out two proposed improvements to Long lane:

- The provision of a footpath from the site to the High Street and a crossing point at the north end of Long Lane; and,
- The widening of Long Lane at the junction of Long Lane and Long Lane Estate.

The footpath to High Street is proposed as a commitment but its final form is only indicative at this stage whilst detailed survey and topographic works are undertaken, and so it is considered that a Grampian condition will need to be applied in the event of any approval, to ensure that this comes forward. It is not considered appropriate to expect a developer of a proposal of this scale to provide a footpath from High Street to the school, which would be approximately

150m. However, the proposed link from the High Street to the site will provide wider highway safety improvements by allowing all users of Long Lane to utilise the footpath to the shop, pub, bus service and provide an all-weather route to the village hall.

Whilst Officers consider it essential for a footpath to be provided along Long Lane, in order to help make the scheme acceptable, it is nonetheless acknowledged that the route may not provide a continuous, unbroken footpath for its full length, and it may not be possible for it to be publically adopted either, as the designs are not fully known at this stage. It is considered that a Grampian-style condition will achieve the path's delivery.

The Highway Authority state that Long Lane between the site and High Street is severely sub-standard in terms of width and footway provision. Whilst it is not possible for the applicant and an application of this size to alleviate all of the existing highway network issues, this application does seek to provide some widening to Long Lane near the junction of Long Lane Estate and provide an almost continuous footpath from the High Street to the proposed development.

Long Lane Estate

As part of this application the proposals that were subject to the first round of public consultation set out the following improvements to Long Lane Estate.

1. Demolition of the existing garages to create additional car parking.
2. Providing in curtilage parking for existing dwellings Nos. 29 and 30 Long Lane including new drop kerbed footway vehicle crossovers, to encourage cars to be parked off-street.
3. Double yellow lines either side of the existing adopted highway to dissuade parking.

Following the continued objections from the Highway Authority the applicant set out that improvements to Long Lane Estate had already been explored but had not met the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. These improvements were eluded to in the Officer's Report when a scheme for 20 dwellings was previously refused on this site. The Officer's Report stated the following:

"... a survey [of Long Lane Estate] was undertaken by officers and it was established that the width of this stretch of carriageway was 4.3 metres but each of the footways were in fact wider than the required standard of 1.5 metres. Whilst officers conclude that bringing this stretch of highway to the required standard is feasible, the Highway Authority stated that it is unlikely to be acceptable once subjected to Safety Audit. Nonetheless, the imposition of a condition requiring improvements to the existing adopted highway through Long Lane Estate is potentially feasible and necessary."

The highways improvements to Long Lane Estate have now been included in addition to the improvements set out in the proposals in the first round of public consultation on the scheme.

The existing unclassified Long Lane Estate Road is less than 4.8m wide and therefore also not wide enough for an HGV such as a refuse vehicle or other delivery vehicle to pass a car without mounting the adjacent footway. Whilst it is acknowledged that the physical constraints of Long Lane Estate Road would not allow this to be completely alleviated, the applicant is proposing a widening of the road to allow for further passing places to be achieved. Whilst these would still not satisfy the Highway Authority's preference for minimum adoptable widths, the widening works would nevertheless provide benefit to the current users of the road and would alleviate some of the concern raised by the Highway Authority in this regard.

Public Right of Way

Notwithstanding the above improvements to Long Lane and Long Lane Estate, should the need arise to use an entirely car-free route, pedestrians can also choose to use an existing Public Right of Way (PRoW) directly opposite the site entrance, to access the village hall, recreation ground and upper end of High Street. The County Council's PRoW Officer stated that although there is no objection to the scheme, the County Council may require surface improvements to compensate for the increased usage of this PRoW.

Whilst the site was allocated for 10 dwellings and this was not a requirement through the Site Allocations policy, the works to improve the ProW are considered necessary in regard to the additional 5 dwellings on the site, being linked to the mitigation required for improving public access to Green Infrastructure & Public Rights of Way network, and in so doing, protecting designated ecological sites by reducing the pressure on those sites for residents' recreation.

Parking

In respect of provision of car parking within the site, the development comprises the following:

- 4 no. 1 bedroom units
- 10 no. 2 and 3 bedroom units
- 1 no. 4 bedroom units

According to Core Strategy Policy CT 6, the development should deliver a minimum of 1.5 spaces per 1-bedroom unit, a minimum of 2 spaces per 2/3 bedroom unit and a minimum of 3 spaces per 4 bedroom unit, amounting to a total on-site requirement of 29 car park spaces.

It is acknowledged the parking within the main part of site proposes 31 car park spaces, which exceeds the requirement set out in Policy CT 6. In addition to this the application also proposes to demolish existing garage spaces to provide a total of 18 unallocated visitor parking spaces. The development is considered to be in accordance with the parking standards required as set out in Core Strategy Policy CT 6, whilst the removal of garages and the ability to provide more practical parking spaces, and manage them accordingly (subject to details by condition), will be able to offer an additional public benefit and minimise the need for on-street parking.

Summary of highway issues

The applicant has set out that the proposed highway improvements are achievable and that the land is within their ownership. However, the revised plans will still not address all of the points raised by the Highway Authority and does not overcome their technical objection to the site. Nevertheless, the site was allocated through the Site Allocations Development Plan and the applicant has provided a number of wider highway network improvements which Officers consider are able to satisfactorily address the impacts from the additional 5 dwellings which are proposed in excess of the 10 which the allocation has already determined could be served at the site. In addition, the works to the PRoW and any use of additional funds could improve site access. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policy CT 5 of the Core Strategy and, despite the objection of the Highway Authority, it is considered that the proposal is in accordance with the objectives of Site Allocation Policy SOU 02 that the development should provide *'safe vehicle access to Long Lane'* and *'contributions towards infrastructure, services and other community needs as required.'*

In considering the rural location of the development, the above considerations and paragraph 109 of the NPPF, it is the opinion of Officers that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on highway safety despite the elevated number of dwellings above that anticipated by policy. Although the Highway Authority maintain their objection it is considered

that the highway improvements proposed within the scheme would provide wider highway network improvements that would address the impacts of the additional dwellings and make the site more accessible and able to be less reliant on the car. It is therefore considered that, if the works proposed can be delivered by Grampian condition prior to the occupation of any dwellings, then the proposal would be in accordance with Policies CT 5 and CT 6 of the adopted Core Strategy and in line with the expectations of SOU 02 to provide safe vehicle access to Long Lane.

7. Foul / Surface Water Drainage and Utilities

Waste Water Treatment

The application has been accompanied by an Anglian Water Pre-Assessment Report (Dated 30 September 2016) which demonstrates that a development of 20 dwellings would have been unlikely to result in any significant burden on foul drainage infrastructure. Anglian Water have re-iterated through the consultation period for this scheme that the Southrepps-Lower St Water Recycling Centre will still have available capacity for these flows.

Surface Water Drainage

It is noted that the area to the north of the site has experienced incidences of surface water flooding and that the existing properties along the northern boundary are approximately 0.75 to 1 metre below the site.

The applicant provided a revised Drainage Strategy supporting this planning application. The Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) previously did not have any objection to the drainage strategy for the previous proposal of 20 dwellings (PF/17/2082), confirming that the drainage strategy is acceptable and that an appropriate surface water drainage scheme is feasible subject to condition. The LLFA have not raised an objection to this scheme for 15 dwellings, subject to the same pre-commencement condition being applied for the detailed proposal to be agreed prior to the commencement of development.

It has been demonstrated with a reasonable level of confidence that surface water flooding can be addressed through sustainable drainage systems. However, a condition would set out that this needs to be further informed by a topographical plan in order to set out how to mitigate exceedance flows on site. Furthermore Finished Floor Levels need to be 300mm above the ground level to ensure that properties would not be subject to a risk of surface water flooding.

The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with Policy EN 10 of the Core Strategy.

Other Utilities

The development is of a scale which is unlikely to place any significant burden on other infrastructure and utilities.

8. Material Planning Considerations

Norfolk County Council did not request financial contributions due to the site being below the 20 dwelling threshold at which NCC would seek contributions.

Other issues

- The ground investigation report and surface water drainage strategy confirms that the development is unlikely to result in contamination of ground water.
- It is recommended that a condition be sought to address how the development can meet the obligations as set out in Policy EN 6 without having an impact upon the AONB and wider landscape.
- In an attempt to reduce any nuisance associated with the construction works on existing properties, it is recommended that a condition be imposed requiring that the demolition of the garages and laying out of the parking spaces in that area should be implemented prior to the commencement of work on site. It is also recommended that additional temporary parking be provided on site for construction workers, which can be confirmed as part of a Construction Management Plan.
- Despite the proposal being contrary to the Norfolk County Council Minerals Core Strategy Policy CS16, the site is allocated through the Site Allocations Development Plan Document and so the loss of mineral resource is inevitable. A condition is proposed to be sought to ensure recycling of aggregate materials on the site.
- It was set out in the previous refused application for 20 dwellings that there was no requirement to undertake any further archaeology on the site, and this is not considered to have changed for this proposal.
- The site is situated within a Groundwater Source Protection Zone (Zone 3) however, it is considered that the findings of the Drainage Strategy demonstrate that this would be mitigated against through Sustainable Drainage Systems. Environmental Health Officers raised no objections to the proposals.
- It is noted that there is surface water flooding to the north of the site on existing neighbouring properties. It is considered that the Drainage Strategy will mitigate the impacts of the development site and that this will not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. However, in Section 7 of this report it is set out that a condition will ensure that further consideration is given to the topography of the site.

9. Planning Obligations

In accordance with Core Strategy policy CT 2 and Site Allocation policy SOU 02, the development must address its impacts by making the following financial contributions:

- Improvements to the Public Right of Way (Southrepps Public Footpath 18) £75 per dwelling (total £1,125)
- 8 of the 15 dwellings (50%) as Affordable Housing for General Needs Housing, including 80% Affordable Rent and 20% Intermediate Tenure (preferably Shared Ownership).
- Public Open Space: £25,442 in total comprising:
 - Allotments £6,810
 - Play enhancement £4,800
 - Parks £13,832

- SPA / SAC visitor impact mitigation contributions £50 per dwelling (total £750)

In addition, the applicant is proposing to provide more planning obligations to weigh in favour of the proposal which are considered to be a public benefit and outweigh the conflict with the adopted Development Plan, outweigh the harm to the heritage assets, outweigh the harm to the AONB and the wider landscape. These are as follows:

- 7 additional affordable houses
- £30,000 towards open space, albeit at the time of writing this is still to be agreed, and Members may consider it more appropriate to explore the feasibility of allocating such a sum of money towards improving access and safety on route to the school instead.

The below highway improvements would be secured by planning conditions on any approval:

- Provision of a footpath from the site to the High Street along the western edge of Long Lane, with a crossing point near the junction of the High Street;
- Widening of Long Lane with the junction of Long Lane Estate; and,
- Modifications to Long Lane Estate.

10. The Planning Balance

In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, planning applications must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Southrepps is a designated Service Village having access to a reasonable range of services and facilities, the allocated site being a logical location for the planned expansion of the village.

However, it is increasingly evident that a scheme for approximately 10 dwellings as required under Policy SOU 02 is not likely to be delivered, evidenced by the lack of interest from open market house builders or developers to take the site forward. This lack of commercial impetus behind a market-housing led scheme has presented an opportunity for Victory Housing as a Registered Provider to put forward a proposal for 15 affordable dwellings.

The development proposed for 15 dwellings represents a departure from the Development Plan Site Allocations Policy SOU 02 in that it proposes 15 affordable dwellings on a site allocated for approximately 10 dwellings, which will likely give rise to some adverse highway impacts contrary to the requirements of Site Allocations Policy SOU 02 and Core Strategy Policy CT 5 and have a greater impact upon the landscape and AONB than a lower density or smaller scale development would otherwise have.

Whilst the development is clearly a departure from policy the primary material consideration in this case is the provision of 15 affordable dwellings. The proposal provides the following public benefits:

- The proposal for 100% affordable housing provides 15 affordable units as opposed to the 5 affordable units that would be delivered on a policy compliant scheme;
- Highways improvements to both Long Lane and Long Lane Estate and the provision of a footpath from the site to High Street;
- An additional supply of amenity greenspace on site; and
- Improvements to the Public Right of Way network;

It remains to be seen if the application will confirm their provision of an extra £30,000 to spend on either the improved safe access to the school to alleviate highways concerns or on further play facilities as advocated by the Parish Council.

In regard to the Historic Environment, it has been demonstrated that the detrimental impact of the proposed development would be very minimal and is considered that above public benefits of the scheme far outweigh the potential minimal impact. The proposal is therefore considered to be in accordance with the NPPF in this regard.

In respect of harm to the AONB and the wider landscape, it is acknowledged that any development in this location will have a potential impact upon the AONB and the wider landscape. It is also noted that the proposed development for 15 dwellings would have more potential impact upon the landscape and AONB than a site in conformity with Policy SOU 02 for approximately 10 dwellings. However, this potential impact has been sufficiently mitigated against through the improved landscaping and the alterations to the layout of the scheme. It is therefore considered that the proposal is in accordance with Policies EN 1 and EN 2.

On balance it is the considered opinion of Officers that the cited material planning considerations including public benefits of affordable housing, the possible additional commuted sum to be used towards public open space or highways improvements, and wider proposed highways improvements in the submitted plans all together outweigh the identified adverse effects associated with non-compliance with the Development Plan, and therefore the recommendation is one of approval, subject to completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure the planning obligation and public benefits described above and subject to compliance with the with the conditions listed below.

RECOMMENDATION

Part 1:

Delegate authority to the Head of Planning to APPROVE subject to:

- 1) Negotiate improvements and amendments to the boundary treatments and landscaping.**
- 2) Liaise with Highways to explore opportunities to provide improved access to the school using the applicant's additional contributions (to be agreed).**
- 3) Satisfactory completion of a S.106 Planning Obligation to cover the following:**
 - Improvements to the local Public Right of Way network, including to Southrepps Public Footpath 18 - £75 per dwelling (total £1,125);
 - Provision of all 15 houses for use as General Needs affordable housing, including 80% Affordable Rent and 20% Intermediate Tenure (preferably Shared Ownership);
 - Public Open Space contributions of £25,442 in total comprising: Allotments £6,810; Play enhancement £4,800; and Parks £13,832;
 - SPA / SAC visitor impact mitigation contributions - £50 per dwelling (total £750);
 - £30,000 towards open space or highway improvements on the route to school (albeit this contribution is still to be confirmed at the time of writing).
- 4) The imposition of the appropriate conditions to include:**
 1. Time Limit – three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted
 2. The development shall be undertaken in strict accordance with the plans

Pre-commencement

1. Construction Management Plan
2. Demolition of the existing garages and subsequent use of the cleared areas for construction vehicles if necessary.
3. Details to be agreed for the provision of a footpath from Long Lane Estate to the High Street as per submitted plans, and completion of the path prior to first occupation.
4. Provision of all highways improvements – modifications to Long Lane Estate and widening to Long Lane junction with Long Lane Estate.
5. Materials to be agreed: External bricks and tiles, windows and doors, external finishing.
6. Boundary treatment detailed designs and materials, to include small mammal access.
7. Details of providing the Category M4 2 dwellings on site.
8. Drainage scheme details, to take into account topography of the site.
9. Finished floor levels informed by the Drainage Strategy and site sections (details to be agreed).
10. Soft Landscaping details (to include measures to prevent ad hoc parking on Public Open Space).
11. Soft Landscaping Management and Maintenance plan.
12. Hard Landscaping details.
13. Hard landscaping Management and Maintenance Plan.
14. Minerals / aggregate materials – details of how on-site resources will be recycled.

Pre-Occupation

15. Provision of Open Space.
16. Open Space Management and Maintenance Plan.
17. Provision of Bird Boxes and Bat Boxes as recommended by the Preliminary Ecological Survey.
18. Restrictions on any external lighting.
19. Obscure glazing to be installed, where appropriate.

And any other conditions considered to be necessary by the Head of Planning

Part 2:

That the application be refused if a suitable section 106 agreement is not completed within 3 months of the date of resolution to approve, and in the opinion of the Head of Planning, there is no realistic prospect of a suitable section 106 agreement being completed within a reasonable timescale.